

To whom it may concern,

OPPOSE H.B. 6667

The basis of this bill, as said in the introduction of it's accompanying "fact sheet" is an unachievable goal, that only ends with the abolition of any firearms ownership across the entire country. I quote from that document "Connecticut is one of the safest states in the country, but even one incident of gun violence is too many." Guns are the same as any item which can be dangerous when used improperly. Automobiles, alcohol, prescription drugs, heavy machinery, lawn equipment, propane and gas appliances all have a non zero amount of risk associated with them, but are deemed extremely safe when the proper procedures and licensing are in place. We do not hold any other items to such a ridiculous standard when they are already heavily regulated and exist in "One of the safest states in the country." Connecticut already has extremely strict firearms laws and permitting process which exceeds the safety controls and processes in place for any other equally dangerous item. and the statistics on firearm violence data in connecticut support that.

On to the more specific items in this bill that are extremely problematic:

Does not address root causes of gun violence; targets legal gun owners and bans open carry

- Open carry being used as intimidation is not substantiated in any data. Open carry still gives police the right to view the permit of anyone in the state of CT, anyone knowingly open carrying for self defense should know this and how to act when a police officer approaches them.
- It is easy for a non-ideal cover garment to ride up, bunch up, or otherwise accidentally reveal a firearm that is trying to be legally concealed. This can lead to situations where a law abiding and licensed pistol carry permit owner could be charged with "Open carry" violations. This can result in people having to defend poor "concealment" in court, and thus leading to a backdoor banning of concealed carry as a fear of being pulled into the expensive legal process.

Prohibits carrying a firearm in an establishment that sells alcohol

- Most restaurants that sell food serve some kind of alcohol, and this bill prohibits carrying even if the person isn't drinking. There are already very strict laws around carrying a firearm and drinking.
- The more places that are illegal to carry, the more difficult it is to carry and obey the law, which then either stops people from being able to defend themselves, or makes people unintentional felons. This is yet another attempt to try and remove the ability to carry, by making it overwhelmingly difficult to legally even though all other laws and processes have been followed.

Limits to one handgun a month, and introduces 10 day waiting period on all firearms.

- No evidence that lawful, permit holding gun owners are purchasing in bulk in Connecticut and selling on black market.
- Getting a pistol permit is already about a 1 year process which requires thorough background checks and educational programs to ensure those wishing to exercise their rights are well suited to do so.

- All legal transactions in connecticut tracked, and serial numbers already traceable back to the original purchaser
- Limits the ability for collectors, competitors, and those seeking self defense tools to acquire the firearms they require and desire if they find their original purchase was not what was expected and need to purchase one that better fits their needs or desires even though those purchased have already been tracked and tied to their permit.
- Further restricts the individual ownership of firearms through arbitrary limitations.

Introduces State licensing scheme

- The ATF already covers this topic, state licensing is further paperwork which is absolutely redundant and not of value.

Bans more semi-automatic rifles including pre-94 “pre-ban” rifles, rimfire rifles and “Others”

- There are no crime statistics correlating rimfire rifles with specific ergonomic and cosmetic features and crime. There are very few, if any crimes committed with these types of firearms.
- The rimfire rifles with similar features to centerfire weapons listed as “assault weapons” are simply replicas of the higher power counterparts, without the lethality. They are largely collectors items.
- There are no crime statistics that correlate pre-94 rifles and “Others” with the causal factors of such violence. The number of deaths attributed to any “other” firearms or and rifles at all (not just pre94) is extremely low, on the order of fractions of a percentage of all violent crimes in the state.
- These sections of the bill are entirely focusing on cosmetic and ergonomic features of rifles that make no difference in the actual lethality of the firearm.
- Firearms that are currently legal to own, become unintentional felonies overnight.

First time possession of >10 magazine a Class D felony

- These are standard capacity in most other states and freely distributed.
- There is no way to enforce this law, and will become tacked on charge in cases which already have long lists of charges.

Requirement of a magazine disconnect feature on firearms that prevents the trigger from being pulled if the magazine is removed

- Point of failure and potential malfunction
- May prevent firing in a high-pressure situation defending one’s life
- Many firearms do not have this feature; further limits firearms that can be sold and effectively a ban on many additional firearms

Requires a Loaded chamber indicator for firearms

- Many firearms do not have this feature; further limits firearms that can be sold and effectively a ban on many additional firearms

Expansion of safe storage

- More difficult for someone to access their firearm in a case of emergency
- Government has no right dictating storage of a firearm in one’s home

OPPOSE H.B. 6816

- Microstamping isn’t feasible for most manufacturers
- Onerous requirement that will lead to more banned weapons Body armor is purely a defensive tool for someone to protect their life

Thank you,

Travis Marshall